





# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/034,041  | 12/20/2001  | James J. Conroy      | CONROY              | 1821             |
| 25889   | 7590        | 10/13/2004           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| WILLIAM COLLARD<br>COLLARD & ROE, P.C.<br>1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD<br>ROSLYN, NY 11576 |             |                      | ARK, DARREN W       |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 3643                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |                 |   |  |
|---|-----------------|---|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | Application No. | Applicant(s)  |  |
|   | 10/034,041      | CONROY, JAMES J.  |  |
|   | Examiner        | Art Unit  |  |
|   | Darren W. Ark   | 3643             |  |

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Response to Non-Final Action

(1) Darren W. Ark.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) William C. Collard.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 23 September 2004

**Time:** 12:30pm EST

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*Rejections of Non-Final Action mailed 6/17/04*

**Claims discussed:**

*15, 18, 19*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*Prior art of record*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**


*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**DARREN W. ARK**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner stated that in response to amendments to claims 18 & 19, the amendments have overcome Pence '441 and Alvarez '539. In regard to claims 15, 18, and 19, Examiner stated that the second embodiment of Pfeiffer, Sr. '763 in Figs. 10-13 read on the claims since they show straight indentations (17b) extending along an exterior surface of the base (26) since they are exposed for interaction with insects. Examiner indicated that Pfeiffer, Sr. discloses a base (device in Figs. 12, 13), straight channels (17b) on an exterior of base (see Figs. 12, 13), protrusions extending in substantially vertical and horizontal directions (27, 26a, 15b), the channels being between the protrusions, at least two sets of protrusions extend vertically (27 in Fig. 12) and two sets extend horizontally (adjacent 15b in Fig. 12) in opposite directions (extend away from each other on different sides of the device). Examiner inquired whether that out of the two sets that extend vertically (or horizontally), that one of the respective sets extends in an opposite direction from the other set of the two sets and that this was not clear. Applicant will clarify this in the next response. Examiner stated whether it would be possible to amend the claims to define the protrusions as being pointed or extend to a pointed end. Applicant declined to limit the shape of the protrusions such that it is defined so narrowly. Applicant suggested amending the claims such that the indentations are defined as being on an outer surface of the base but Examiner stated that the indentations are defined as proposed in Figs. 10-13. Applicant suggested amending the claims to define the indentations extending between two rows of protrusions which each comprise at least two protrusions and Examiner agreed that such an amendment might overcome the Pfeiffer, Sr. patent. Applicant will file an amendment for formal consideration as of 10/6/04 to address these issues and attempt to define the claims over the Pfeiffer, Sr. patent.